

**Colusa Subreach Planning Project Advisory Workgroup
Draft Meeting Summary
May 30, 2006 10:00 AM - 2:00 PM
Granzella's Inn
Williams, CA**

**Summary prepared by Carolyn Penny, Facilitator, Common Ground: Center for
Cooperative Solutions with assistance from Ellen Gentry, Sacramento River
Conservation Area Forum**

***Note: The next AW meeting will be held September 11, 2006 from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m.,
location TBD.***

Present:

AW: Burt Bundy, Mike Fehling, Armand Gonzales, John Garner, Greg Golet (alternate for Dawit Zeleke), Kelly Moroney

Staff: Ellen Gentry (SRCAF), Facilitator Carolyn Penny (Common Ground), Project Manager Gregg Werner (TNC)

Guests: Rebecca Benassini (Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.), Ladybug (Maureen) Doherty (State Reclamation Board), Walter Kieser (EPS), Kristen Strohm (EDAW), Jeff Sutton (Family Water Alliance), Ron Unger (EDAW)

Agenda:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Approximate Start Time</u>	<u>Lead Person</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
1.	10:00	Carolyn Penny, Facilitator	Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review, April Meeting Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions. Approve agenda. Approve April summary.
2.	10:15	Gregg Werner, Greg Golet, All AW Members	Updates on Subcommittee work , status of planning and research projects and LIDAR elevation mapping results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gain an update on the Subcommittee efforts, research projects, and next steps.
3.	10:50	Burt Bundy, Gregg Werner, All AW Members	Good Neighbor Policy Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the status of the Good Neighbor Policy
4.	11:00	Public	Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receive comment.
5.	11:15	Gregg Werner, All AW Members	Fiscal and Economic Analysis Process Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and comment on process plan for the fiscal and economic analysis.
6.	11:35	Public	Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receive comment.
7.	11:50		Lunch and Break	
8.	12:20	Gregg Werner, All AW Members	Pest and Regulatory Effects Analysis Study Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and comment on study design for the pest and regulatory

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Approximate Start Time</u>	<u>Lead Person</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
				effects analysis.
9.	12:50	Public	Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Receive comment.
10.	1:05	Greg Golet, All AW Members	Cruise n' Tarry Baseline Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review and comment on baseline assessment for Cruise n' Tarry site
11.	1:30	Public	Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Receive comment.
12.	1:45	Gregg Werner, All AW Members	Next Meeting Dates, Next Agenda, and Next Steps Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Shape next agenda. Confirm summer meeting dates.
13.	2:00		Adjourn	

Review of April Meeting Summary

The April meeting summary was amended to include Jeff Sutton's changes requested by email. With those changes, the April meeting summary was accepted as final.

Updates on Subcommittee work, status of planning and research projects and LIDAR elevation mapping results

Gregg Werner updated the AW on the status of the planning and research projects.

In regard to the hydraulic modeling analysis, the thalweg analysis is complete. The 2-dimensional model data points have been calibrated. The next step will be to incorporate the LIDAR data (discussed just below.) The Large Woody Debris survey is expected soon now that the river levels have lowered. The Hydraulic Analysis subgroup is expected to meet in the next 1-2 months.

In regard to the recreation planning effort, the first of 3 public meetings was held with about 30 people. In response to John Garner's question, Gregg indicated there was not much conversation regarding the boat ramp. Gregg indicated there was a desire expressed to connect funding for management to an increase in public access by land. Armand Gonzales asked whether there was discussion about keeping Robert's ditch open for pumping. Mike Fehling noted that it is not clear what will happen with those water rights holders with a new boat ramp, or the outcome desired by those water rights holders. He noted further that it would cost somewhere in a range of \$20,000 to \$100,000 to dredge and remove dredged materials. Those funds are not generated by fees to the park and would have to be from the general fund. Mike observed there was not much opinion expressed calling for increased access and he would like to see the full spectrum of opinion at the next public meeting. The next public meeting will be July 20 at the industrial park. In the meantime, there will be additional conversations with the most involved agencies and neighboring landowners.

Greg Golet described briefly the hydraulic analysis LIDAR results. He referred to several maps in the meeting room and reminded the AW that the accuracy is +/- 6 inches. He described the mapping as

helpful for modeling and for flood impacts analysis. Kelly stated that this sort of map was very useful to address concerns of landowners adjacent to a project in the Chico area. The accurate results led to modification of a site-specific plan. Burt added that SRCAF has made a grant request for LIDAR mapping of the whole conservation area. Gregg indicated that efforts are underway to make these LIDAR results publicly available.

Since Pest/Regulatory Effects and Fiscal/Economic Analysis projects are part of presentations later in the agenda, discussion of updates for those efforts was deferred.

Good Neighbor Policy Update

Burt Bundy indicated that a draft of the GNP was presented to the Board of the SRCAF on May 25 by Brendon Flynn, GNP Committee Chair. Judging from the discussion, the mitigation fund concept presents the largest area of concern due to questions about the desired degree of definition and legal practicality. The draft policy was adopted as a white paper for further discussion. It will be back before the Board on July 20.

John asked whether there was discussion on legal changes to allow public funds to go to private lands for mitigation. Burt replied that the issue was discussed at the committee level with numerous good comments. He noted that the issue arises in terms of the selling of mitigation credits. He also noted that, as a non-profit organization, SRCAF cannot influence legislation.

Public Comment

Ladybug Doherty noted that the April AW meeting summary indicates a language bias in referring to comments of people from Colusa. She added that she gathered from the newspaper that there were more concerns expressed at the public recreation planning meeting than are being expressed here. She closed by expressing hope that there will be more comments at the next public recreation planning meeting.

Fiscal and Economic Analysis Process Plan

Walter Kieser and Rebecca Benassini of Economic and Planning Systems (EPS) gave a presentation on the draft study design for the fiscal and economic analysis. They discussed the major steps of the study (background and research on Colusa/Glenn agricultural sectors; definition of key fiscal and economic linkages; building a fiscal model; building an economic model; and estimation of fiscal and economic effects.)

After the presentation, John recommended contact with Woody Yerxa regarding predation and trespass. He noted that impacts may be intense for particular landowners although low overall. Greg reminded the AW that the Pest/Regulatory Impacts study will examine pest effects and is a separate study.

Greg asked whether Walter and Rebecca will include the impacts of projected habitat improvements in their analysis. Walter indicated they will include such impacts when possible and he is cautious about too much conjecture.

Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time.

Pest and Regulatory Effects Analysis Study Design

Ron Unger and Kristen Strohm of EDAW gave a presentation on the draft study design for the pest and regulatory effects study. They described the stakeholder outreach plan and a draft outline for the project report. The draft outline included an introduction, regulatory constraints on agricultural operations, regulatory solutions, effects of pest species, and pest effects solutions.

In response to the presentation, Armand asked whether EDAW is looking at the abundance of the various pest species. Kristen responded that information would be examined where available. John reminded the group that a food source for pests on the restoration site and buffers would be preferable to payments to the neighbor farmer. Armand reminded EDAW that the AW would like to include an analysis of impact during the construction and establishment phases, not just after full restoration.

Greg asked the AW how farmers typically deal with pest issues and crop transitions unrelated to habitat restoration. John noted pests are a significant issue and are usually dealt with by eradication. Kelly and Burt stated that there can be pest issues for a neighboring orchard when an old orchard is pulled out.

In terms of regulatory impact, Gregg requested that EDAW look at state level pesticide regulation in addition to federal. Ron agreed the analysis will include the regulation by the California Department of Pesticide Regulation. John added that the strict DPR regulations have addressed most pesticide drift concerns.

In regard to the high/medium/low classification of pest species, Kristen responded to a question from John to indicate that the priorities are based on the extent of the damage or problem. Density is included in that analysis.

AW members had the following comments on specific pest species:

- Mike – what is pest aspect of coyotes? Holes, sheep predation
- Burt – looking at feral animals? Feral pigs not an issue in this subreach (more in Tehama County).
- Ladybug – trespass/poaching
- Armand – skunks, raccoons (low or medium); include if an issue for agriculture
- John – otters burrow. Disruptive to irrigation systems. Medium priority.
- Mike – surprised muskrat not in medium category. Holes in levees.
- John – rats are problem (low priority) with rice. 7-year cycle. Keep cycling information in mind for all pests.
- Jeff Sutton– rice farming happens right outside levees. Deer are a high priority pest.
- John – raccoons and skunks – impact on other species. Refer to it lightly.

Burt raised the question of whether mosquitoes and other pests with impacts on human habitation would be included. Greg responded that focus would be beyond the scope of the study. Kelly advised maintenance of the focus on agricultural impacts. Ron agreed to revisit

the possible inclusion of human habitation impacts further into the efforts, keeping in mind the budget limitations.

Greg commented that the mechanism of impact should be addressed for all the species.

Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time.

Cruise N' Tarry Baseline Assessment

Greg presented the baseline assessment for the Cruise N' Tarry site. The eight acres of planned restoration is currently fallow. A steep eroding cut bank is a critical site for an emergency provision. Baseline assessment components include: surrounding land uses, geomorphology and historic river channel migration, elevation and inundation frequency, a detailed soils survey, remnant vegetation communities, special status species, bird counts, and a non-native mammal survey. Restoration recommendations include active horticultural restoration and multiple plant communities to respond to soils and the inundation pattern.

Jeff asked whether the State Reclamation Board has any plans for the property. Burt responded that he didn't believe the Reclamation Board had any plans for restoration of that site. Gregg reminded the AW that the DWR wanted the property assessed as a mitigation site, keeping in mind that it would like to keep the northern part for weir maintenance and flood staging.

Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time.

Next Meeting

September 11, 2006

Agenda

Project updates

Preliminary restoration plans

Remaining baseline assessments

Presentation: Fiscal/economic impacts

Hydraulic analysis interim products

Interim Follow – Up

- AW members send input to EPS via email to Rebecca on the fiscal/economic analysis design plan by June 6. Rebecca's email address is: rbenassini@epsys.com
- Input to EDAW on the pest/regulatory effects design plan can use the public comment sheets or be emailed to:
 - ggolet@tnc.org
 - strohmk@edaw.com
- Project updates: Gregg will send project updates to AW first week in August by email and hard copy. Other products for September meeting will be distributed with the agenda approximately 10 days in advance of the meeting.